

REMARKS

Status of Claims

The Office Action mailed January 14, 2008 has been reviewed and the comments therein were carefully considered. Claims 1-3, 6-11, 4-16, 25 and 26 are pending in the application and are currently rejected.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as failing to have proper antecedent basis for “the television”. Applicant has corrected this claim.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-3, 6-7, 9-11, 14-16, 25 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ellis et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2005/0028208) (herein after “Ellis ‘208”) in view of Ellis et al. (U.S. Patent 6,774,926) (hereinafter “Ellis ‘926”). Applicant traverses this rejection.

The Office Action on page 3 states that Ellis discloses displaying the EPG on the first video display of the remote device, and refers to Paragraph 0097. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Ellis ‘208 in paragraph 0097 does not disclose anything regarding a video display on a remote device, let alone on a “video display of the web-enabled cellular phone”, as recited by Claim 1. Ellis ‘208 in paragraph 0097 and the corresponding Figs. 6a and 6b do not disclose any type of video display on a remote device.

The Office Action on page 3 states that Ellis also discloses storing the EPG selections on a storage device, and refers to Paragraph 0072 for “the remote program guide access device storing the EPG data”. Applicant disagrees. Ellis ‘208 in paragraph 0072 describes storing program guide **data**, i.e. information about upcoming programs. It does not describe EPG **selections**. As described in Claim 1, EPG selections are received from the cellular phone, and are to be displayed on a display associated with a television. These EPG **selections** are stored in a storage device. Applicant asserts that neither Ellis ‘208 nor Ellis ‘926, either alone or

combined, disclose or suggest this feature. Accordingly, Applicant asserts that Claims 1 and 9, and all claims that depend upon them, are allowable.

Regarding Claims 25 and 26, the Office Action on page 5 states that Ellis discloses that the EPG includes an indication of which buttons are appropriate for the EPG, and refers to Figures 7-10. Applicant disagrees. Ellis '208 in Figures 7-10 (and the corresponding specification) does not disclose anything regarding an indication of which buttons are appropriate for the EPG. Ellis '208 in Figures 7-10 merely shows different screen shots of a program guide. No disclosure or suggestion is provided for any indication of what buttons may be appropriate for an EPG. Accordingly, Applicant asserts that Claims 25 and 26 are allowable separate from their dependence upon allowable parent claims.

Claims 8, 16 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ellis et al. (U.S. Patent Publication Application No. 2005/0028208) in view of Ellis et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,774,926) in further view of Terakado et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,246,441). Applicant traverses this rejection. These claims depend from allowable parent claims, and are therefore allowable.

Conclusion

All rejections having been addressed, Applicant respectfully submits that the instant application is in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully solicits notification of allowance. Should the Examiner have any questions, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: May 14, 2008

By: /David Lowry/
David D. Lowry
Registration No. 38,538
BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.
28 State Street, 28th Floor
Boston, MA 02109-1775
Telephone: 617-720-9600
Fax: 617-720-9601